DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 773 SO 013 384

AUTHOR Garcia, Ricardo L.
TITLE Education for Cultural Pluralism: Global Roots Stew. Fastback 159.
INSTITUTION Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-87367-159-7
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 36p.
AVAILABLE FROM Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402 ($0.75 single copy, quantity discounts available).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Education; Cultural Enrichment; *Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; Global Approach; Higher Education; Multicultural Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this monograph is to explore some of the approaches and programs that have recently emerged in schools and colleges throughout the United States to cope with increasing ethnic and cultural diversity among students. Information is presented on cultural pluralism, the relationship of cultural pluralism to ethnic and cultural consciousness, integrating immigrants into the school system, global education, multicultural education, intergroup education, bilingual education, and educational opportunity for culturally different students. For each of these approaches, information is presented on background, definition, variations in types of programs based on the general approach, scope, benefits and shortcomings, synthesis of literature describing and evaluating the approach, and a brief overview of related legislation. The author suggests, generally, that schools do as much in the area of cultural education as can be done well, and, specifically, that schools implement at least one of the programs described in the monograph as culturally-related. Conclusions from this overview of culturally-related programs and approaches are that cultural educators should solidify their efforts and that students will gain in self-awareness if they participate in an investigation of their ethnic heritage, their current ethnic or cultural group status, and the linkage between their national group and their countries of origin. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202773

EDUCATION FOR CULTURAL PLURALISM:

GLOBAL ROOTS STEW

FASTBACK 159

Ricardo L. Garcia

Phi Delta Kappa
Educational Foundation

SO 013 384

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. KLIEWER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RICARDO L. GARCIA

Ricardo L. Garcia was born in a coal mining camp in northern New Mexico. He received a B.A. degree from New Mexico Highlands University in 1963, taught in secondary schools in northern New Mexico and Wisconsin, and received the doctorate in education at the University of Denver in 1973. His dissertation and subsequent research and articles in the area of culture, language, and education have appeared in various professional journals and three books of selected readings. Garcia has designed and implemented bilingual-bicultural education programs for Chicanos in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Utah schools, conducted numerous workshops and inservice sessions for teachers on bilingual and multicultural education, served as a consultant to the Office of Bilingual Education, HEW, the Danforth Foundation, and the Ford Foundation.

He currently coordinates multicultural education for the College of Education at the University of Utah, conducts bilingual and multicultural inservice training, and teaches courses in multicultural education. He is the author of fastbacks #84 *Learning in Two Languages*, #107 *Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multi-Ethnic Education* and a forthcoming textbook, *Teaching in a Pluralistic Society*, to be published by Harper and Row.

Series Editor, Derek L. Burleson

Education for Cultural Pluralism: Global Roots Stew

By Ricardo L. Garcia

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 81-80017
ISBN 0-87367-159-7
Copyright © 1981 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

This fastback is sponsored by the Arizona State University Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa through a generous financial contribution by one of its members, Glenn F. Burton.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 6

The Challenging Decades 7

The Portending Pluralistic Culture 9

Global Education 12

Multicultural Education 15

Intergroup Education 18

Bilingual Education 20

Seeing Similarities and Differences 23

Equal Educational Opportunity and Cultural Education 28

Opening a New Frontier 30

Footnote References 32

List of Resources 32

Introduction

Global Roots Stew represents three human concerns. *Global* represents the concern of thinking and acting as citizens of one planet, Earth. *Roots* represents the concern of being connected with the past. *Stew* represents the concern of belonging to a harmonious society while retaining a unique identity.

The Challenging Decades

A friend of mine recently became a middle school principal. He spent the entire summer preparing for the coming year. On the first day of school, all was in order: scheduling, teachers, transportation, catered hot lunches. Then Jai Chang Choi appeared in the office with his three brothers and one sister, none of whom spoke English. All had recently arrived from Viet Nam. No one else in the school spoke Vietnamese. Later that morning several girls insisted on seeing the principal. They wanted to try out for the football team. They had heard that they have a right to full participation in all school activities. At noon, several students, recent immigrants from Saudi Arabia wou'd not eat their lunch. Weiners, sauerkraut, and milk make a decent menu; however weiners contain pork, and Muslims are prohibited from eating pork. This was only midday! My friend was ready to quit or face the challenges of the day.

The realities that confront educators today are the increasing ethnic and cultural diversity of our nation in the last two decades of this century. As recently as spring of 1980 thousands of Cuban, Southeast Asian, and other immigrants came to our shores to be assimilated into the American scene. Instant communication and rapid transportation have served to shrink the world, forcing us to think and act in global terms. The phenomenon of constant change makes yesterday's truths today's myths and tomorrow's falsehoods. Consequently, in the next 20 years we face even more cultural contact and ethnic diversity in an ever shrinking and changing world. These are challenging realities. They will be with us for awhile; others will arise.

Response to these challenges has been the emergence of a number of

programs that focus on the relationship between culture and education. I place such under the rubric of cultural education. This fastback will attempt to define, clarify, and synthesize some of those programs that have emerged in U.S. public schools and universities. First, the portending cultural pluralism will be analyzed, followed by a discussion on the relationship between cultural education programs and equal educational opportunities. While space limitations do not allow this to be the final word on cultural education programs, it is an attempt to begin the important process of synthesizing what many may consider disparate programs. Hopefully, it will encourage others to join in the quest to solidify cultural education.

The Portending Pluralistic Culture

We live in an ever-changing society. Both national and international events force us to make changes. Technological change, when coupled with the information explosion, will dramatically modify the substance as well as the process of education. Hence, teaching practices and academic content will experience continual modification and adaptation. Clearly, we are faced with change as a permanent condition of American life.

The U.S. is a pluralistic society with a myriad of ethnic, religious, social, and cultural groups. These groups are loosely held together by a cultural democracy based on precepts of constitutional government that guarantees equality under the law.

Based on such philosophic precepts as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech, American cultural democracy is more than a governmental system; it is a sociocultural system of individual freedoms and responsibilities that permeate the entire society. The undergirding belief is that people are able to choose their religion, their politics, their spouses, and their fates. Individual freedoms, options, and responsibilities tend to encourage pluralism and diversity within the confines of cultural democracy.

The demography of the U.S. is rapidly changing. Black Americans are slowly but deliberately entering the mainstream of American life, holding high political office and influential positions in business. The Spanish-speaking population may surpass blacks as the largest minority group in the country. Both Asian Americans and native Americans are expanding in numbers, although not at the rate of the Spanish Americans. Other non-Europeans are making their presence felt,

especially those from the Middle East and Southeast Asia. All these groups are, to a certain degree, solidifying their economic and political position, building toward a future when their participation in American life will have critical impact on our lives and our institutions. This means that our demography will be vastly different, because a much larger percentage of U.S. citizens will be culturally different and nonwhite.

Just as U.S. demography is changing, so is its language. Expanding international communications and trade, the emerging bilingual education movement within the U.S., and the awakening of U.S. citizens to the fact that the English language is a minority language in the Western hemisphere will catapult our society toward bilingualism and perhaps multilingualism. English will remain the national language, but other languages also will become accepted, respected, and taught in the schools. We will be compelled by world events to learn other languages and cultures.

Recently, a Presidential Commission on Foreign Languages and International Education reported to then President Carter that Americans were embarrassingly monolingual and recommended that comprehensive foreign language and international education programs be federally funded in the public schools, colleges, and universities. The Commission's report calls for a comprehensive, rational approach to overcome our monolingualism and provincialism and to move toward internationalization of American culture.

Our future society will need a formal policy of linguistic pluralism, with English as the national standard but multilingualism as the goal. For too long the U.S. has insisted upon an English-only policy. This insistence was based on the desire to build national identity and unity. Now American culture has a national identity; the language is secure. The next logical step is a policy of multilingualism.

Communication in business, government, and the mass media will continue to be predominantly in English. However, schools will be supported through state and federal funds to teach a second language as a basic academic subject. Official policy will encourage, if not mandate, instruction in other languages. Bilingual teachers may become the rule rather than the exception.

The impact of the ethnic awareness movement of the 1970s will increase in the next decades. People will continue the search for roots of their ethnic or cultural heritage. They will also become acquainted with the unique contributions made by other U.S. ethnic and cultural groups. Thus, ethnic pluralism will pervade the future society, moving beyond the melting pot notions of early 20th century America. Ethnic minority groups will participate equitably in the new pluralistic society.

The 20th century's last decades will see a decline in rugged individualism and self-reliance as our national ethos. Doctrines emphasizing social interdependence, social cohesion, and social action will replace individualism. As the U.S. evolves into a post-industrial society, ideologies will emerge that plead for a greater sense of community and greater industrial and corporate social responsibility. Within this societal transformation, all ethnic and cultural groups will need to recognize and accept the inevitability of *e pluribus unum*.

As different as the nations of the world are, they co-exist on the same planet and are interdependent and reliant upon each other for their survival. All national groups must go beyond their culture and ethnicity to address broader issues of human survival within an increasingly complex and hazardous post-industrial society. As all the movements of the 1970s accelerate into the next decades, synergism—shared, collective, regenerating energy—should be the rallying cry rather than rampant competition for limited resources.

What this means for cultural education is that educators at all levels must help people to make ethnic and cultural differences amenable to a pluralistic society.

Global Education

Cultural education programs have evolved in response to specific societal needs. As educational ideas, they are not necessarily new, yet each emerged to serve a different function. *Intergroup education* emerged with the desegregation of schools. *Global education* emerged when Soviet technology threatened U.S. military supremacy. *Multicultural education* emerged with the rise of ethnic awareness in the civil rights movement. *Bilingual education* emerged when Mexican Americans and other Spanish-speaking groups insisted on equal educational opportunities. Let us first consider global education.

After reading Edith King's *The World: Context For Teaching In The Elementary School*, I remember thinking, "old wine in a new bottle." Later, I visited a museum where the first photographs of the earth as viewed from the moon were displayed. The earth appeared to be small and fragile as it spun in space. World-mindedness no longer seemed to be old wine in a new bottle.

Once seeing the moon shot of the earth, I was struck with the thought that it is a single physical system, dependent on the position of the sun and other planetary forces. As I looked at the clouds I realized another aspect of interdependency. Water on the ground vaporizes, forms clouds, drifts over the land, and rains. Plants grow from the nourishment of the rain, and sun, and the earth's minerals. And so the cycle continues.

Then my thoughts turned to the cultural interdependence of human beings. Every morning as I start my car I enlist the assistance of thousands of others who pumped the oil that makes the car run, the miners who dug the iron to make the steel to hold the car together. That

human beings are interdependent is not a new idea. What is new is the realization that humans must begin to behave in such a way that their interdependence will enhance their survival—rather than their demise—as a global society.

Educators who have studied this notion have proposed educational programs that provide a global supranational perspective that goes beyond the scope of what is traditionally called international education, which has tended to view the world as the study of nations on different continents, separated by oceans or other geographic barriers. Thus, students have been taught to view other nations as "over there," foreign and far away.

The scope of global education prepares ". . . students to cope with global interdependence and cultural pluralism, which involves relationships, events, and forces that cannot be contained within old national or cultural boundaries . . ."[1] In the literature on global and intercultural education, I found at least three overriding goals of global education:

1. *Global education should provide experiences that reduce provincialism and ethnocentrism.* All too often students are introduced to other cultures as being "primitive" or "underdeveloped." Cultures that are not as industrialized as the U.S., or that do not have a similar standard of living, are viewed as simple by comparison. This goal is to teach students how to perceive other cultures from a relative point of view.

2. *Global education should provide experiences that teach students to think of themselves as both individuals and as members of the global human family.* To insure healthy emotional and personal development, educators have long stressed the importance of helping students build a positive self-concept. While building a positive self-concept is essential, it is only the first step toward personal development and well being. Students also need to develop a global conception of themselves, with their lives and fates intertwined with all of the peoples and events of the earth.

3. *Global education should provide experiences that prepare students to cope rationally with global pluralism.* Once students are prepared to deal with other cultures (goals 1 and 2), they will have to know

how to deal with the pluralism that is inevitable in the global society. In their future lives students will confront jingoism, racism, nativism, and other pernicious outcomes of extreme nationalism and ethnocentrism. They will need ways of rationally dealing with these attitudes if they are to interact meaningfully in a global society. This goal also speaks to the need for preparing students to understand and to deal with cultural shock. Rather than dismissing cultural shock as a necessary, temporary evil, this goal will prepare students to use cultural shock as a means to enhance their personal growth and development.

In April 1971 a worldwide conference of educators was convened in Zurich, Switzerland, to explore the goals and objectives of global education for secondary schools. The conferees agreed upon three global education objectives that are still viable:

1. To acquire greater sensitivity and understanding of other people's cultures and values without judging their worth on the basis of preconceived notions;

2. To improve the data base for understanding international decision making and its implications;

3. To learn the nature and importance of history in shaping contemporary society.[2]

To accomplish these objectives traditional social studies and foreign language approaches can be utilized. But in addition, the conference recommended three alternative approaches: *peace studies, future studies,* and *development studies.* Peace studies focus on topics pertaining to worldwide conflict resolution, world law, disarmament, and control of violence. Future studies focus on topics pertaining to future world developments and stress the creation of alternative means of dealing with the resolution of human and cultural problems and conflicts. Development studies focus on the quality of living of people throughout the world, with the goal of creating a heightened awareness of the conditions that hinder the development of a decent standard of living in both affluent and poor nations.

Multicultural Education

Multicultural Education is coming to be viewed as a valid educational program. Numerous professional education organizations have endorsed the idea; among them are the National Education Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the American Association of Teacher Education. Numerous guides, articles, and textbooks have appeared in past years. Two Phi Delta Kappa fastbacks have been published on the subject: 87, *Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises,* and 107, *Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multiethnic Education.*

Multicultural education is the generic term for broadly-based programs to confront ethnocentric or exclusionary educational practices and programs. Its intent is to foster understanding and respect for ethnic and minority groups. Focusing directly on the study of U.S. ethnic and minority groups, it subsumes multiethnic education, ethnic studies, and women's studies.

Multiethnic education is the study of U.S. ethnic groups, with special attention given to U.S. racial or ethnic minority groups that traditionally have been intentionally and unintentionally excluded in educational programs. This approach introduces students to the complex cultural diversity within U.S. society. The approach has at least two broad objectives: 1) to teach students about U.S. ethnic diversity, sometimes called "cultural awareness," and 2) to teach students about their own unique ethnic heritages. James Banks writes:

> A major goal of multiethnic education is to provide all students with the skills, attitudes, and knowledge they need to function within their ethnic culture, the mainstream culture, and within and across other ethnic cultures.[3]

White students are thus introduced to other U.S. ethnic groups;

ethnic minority students are taught about their own ethnic minority culture as well as the cultural heritage of the mainstream.

An effective multiethnic program would permeate the entire school. It would be more than simply adding content to the social studies or language arts, more than a day or a week dedicated to some ethnic group, e.g., Black American Week or Native American Day. Ideally, all academic programs, including math and science, would include multiethnic content. A school's policies would accommodate differing cultural modes; and procedures governing ability grouping, suspensions, testing, and counseling would be nondiscriminatory.

Informally, teachers and staff as well as students would practice respect for linguistic and cultural differences. Eventually, an ambiance of acceptance for cultural pluralism would prevail.

Multiethnic education is not a new idea in American schools. Ethnic schools existed in the New England colonies. In the 19th century, Japanese and Chinese ethnic schools were established in Hawaii and in California. On the east coast, especially in New York City, Jewish schools were common. These ethnic schools were attempts to sustain the group's religion, language, and culture. They supplemented public schools, and students usually attended them after public school hours, in the evenings, or on weekends. However, they served only the ethnic or religious group for whom they were established.

By the early 20th century scholars began to promote intercultural studies for the public schools. The rationale for intercultural studies was to teach about the cultures of the new European immigrants in order to foster better understanding among students. By teaching about the immigrant cultures, by fostering respect and understanding for the immigrants' languages, customs, and traditions, intercultural education attempted to ease the otherwise harsh assimilation process experienced by the immigrant students.

In the 1960s, minority groups began to pressure public schools, colleges, and universities to include ethnic studies in the academic program. At first, these ethnic studies programs were intended for the ethnic groups themselves. Later, as the programs developed, their goals expanded to include cultural understandings of ethnic minority groups for all interested students.

Another aspect of multicultural education is women's studies. During the 1960s and 1970s much progress has been made in rectifying the long history of neglect and discrimination of women. Efforts on behalf of equity for women have taken two directions in the schools: women's studies programs on college and university campuses and Title IX compliance in educational institutions that receive federal funds (see fastback 156, *Title IX: Implications for Education of Women*).

Title IX of the Education Amendment Acts of 1972 stipulates that female students be allowed to participate in school athletic teams; school subjects traditionally considered the domain of only one sex are to be open to both sexes. Education institutions are mandated to eliminate educational policies or practices that tend to segregate or otherwise discriminate against students on the basis of sex.

Some colleges and universities have established women's resource centers or women's studies programs devoted to the academic pursuit of feminist concerns. Conducting research on the historical, scientific, and political contributions of women is intended to raise the consciousness of students regarding the significant roles that women have played in society. Another thrust of the feminist movement has been efforts to develop non-sexist education programs that are free of sexism and sex role stereotyping. Analysis of basic reading texts, math and science books, and American history books is encouraged as a way to eliminate sex biases in textbooks.

In theory, women's studies should be an integral part of multicultural education. In actuality, what has happened is that ethnic studies groups and women's studies groups have found that they are in competition for the same, limited, educational resources. This has resulted on some campuses in an estrangement between these two thrusts in multicultural education. In the rare situations where women's studies and ethnic studies have joined forces in the academic marketplace, they have emerged as important and viable areas of academic pursuit. Unfortunately, on most campuses the two thrusts have not yet rallied around a common cause.

Intergroup Education

Intergroup education began in the 1950s with a nationwide project conducted by the American Council of Education,[4] which focused on intergroup programs and practices in elementary and secondary schools and in teacher education programs.

The project's goal was to subdue the conflict that existed between Christians, Jews, whites, and racial minorities by stressing the similarities commonly held by all Americans. Religious and cultural differences were somewhat de-emphasized, although they were acknowledged, and at times included in the curriculum. Curriculum materials were specially designed by teachers to deal with their unique classroom circumstances. Teachers and administrators were trained to use intergroup relations techniques.

From the council's nationwide project sprang other intergroup education projects, especially with the advent of school desegregation. The general purpose of these programs was to help educators and students understand what happens when different racial, ethnic, and religious groups interact. Intergroup education emphasizes an empathy-building approach where students learn to "walk in the moccasins" of another person in order to learn to live with others, especially when the "others" may be racially or ethnically different. The theory of intergroup education holds that to foster positive behavior between different groups, contact between them should be:

1. Sustained over a period of time;
2. Planned to include the two groups in achievement of common tasks;
3. Planned to insure equal status between the two groups.

The following are some basic concepts underlying intergroup education:

1. *Every person needs to belong to or have a sense of belonging to a group.*

Group membership is a fact of life. To a large extent, a person's self-concept is formed by group membership. A person's ethnic or cultural group provides a system of values and behaviors, and in many instances, a language or a dialect other than standard English. However, there are individuals who feel they have no ethnic group affiliation because of the forces of assimilation. Group membership should be a source of strength and social sustenance rather than a source of shame or anxiety.

2. *Ethnic groups have both similarities and differences.*

This concept introduces students to the notion of cross-cultural understanding and communications. It encourages them to examine the differences and similarities among groups and to analyze objectively the myths of racial superiority. For example, students can explore the idea that there is only one biological human race, but that in the U.S., racial characteristics have tended to make a social difference.

3. *Segregated people develop myths, prejudices, and stereotypes about each other.*

This concept teaches students to analyze the intergroup relations process in terms of two questions: 1) What happens when a minority group and a majority group come into contact? and 2) What happens when a minority group and a majority group do not come into contact? Students may study such processes as ingroup/outgroup behavior (individual and institutional), ethnocentrism, racism, elitism, and sexism, as well as psychological processes that lead to stereotypical thinking and prejudice.

Intergroup education can use the community as a vital source for curriculum development. A teacher, counselor, or principal, with a knowledge of the school's community, will find the interlocking economic and religious networks of great value in developing curriculum for intergroup education approaches.

Bilingual Education

Because a common language is considered by many to be essential to national unity, the decision as to which language(s) should be used as the medium of instruction in a nation's school is critical. In the U.S. during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, feelings about American nationalism ran so high that all states enacted laws that prohibited the use of non-English languages for instructional purposes in the public schools. These laws, known as English-only statutes, have been since repealed with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Lau v. Nichols*.

In 1968 Public Law 90-247, *The Bilingual Education Act*, was enacted. It stated that it was "to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet the special education needs . . . [of] children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English." The act provided for the federal government to assist financially in the development of bilingual education programs in the public schools.

The Comprehensive Bilingual Education Amendment Act of 1973 provided assistance for training of bilingual teachers and bilingual teacher trainers and for extending and improving existing bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials. The rationale for this legislation is that: 1) large numbers of children have limited English-speaking ability; 2) many of these children have a cultural heritage that differs from that of English-speaking people; and 3) a primary means by which children learn is through using their language and cultural heritage.

A major catalyst for bilingual education was the 1974 Supreme

Court ruling in *Lau v. Nichols*. The case involved the San Francisco school district where all students are taught in the same language, English. The Court ruled that the school district did not provide equal educational opportunity since a sizeable number of students' native language was not English but Chinese. Consequently, these students experienced low academic achievement and high attrition. While the ruling did not mandate bilingual instruction for non-English speaking or limited English-speaking students, it did stipulate that special language programs were necessary if schools were to provide equal educational opportunity for such students. While *Lau* did not establish a bilingual policy for U.S. schools, it did make bilingual education legitimate.

The U.S. government has no official language policy. In practice, American English is the nation's standard language. Yet, no laws or legislation exist that mandate American English as the national standard. Because of this ambivalency, U.S. bilingual education programs vary. They can be placed into three general categories:

Transitional Bilingual Education. With this approach the students' native language is used as the medium of instruction while concurrently they are taught English as a second language. When students are able to receive instruction in English, then the use of the non-English instruction is discontinued. Thus, students' native language is used temporarily until they can function with English-only classroom instruction.

Maintenance Bilingual Education. With this approach students' native language and culture are sustained throughout the elementary grades. The students begin instruction in all subjects in their native language. After they can read and write in their native language, they are introduced to English as a second language. This approach strives to maintain full bilingualism throughout the elementary grades.

Restoration Bilingual Education. This approach attempts to restore the students' native language. It is utilized especially by native Americans and other U.S. ethnic groups, e.g., Greeks and Italians, to revitalize the students' native language. Much like the maintenance approach, the restoration approach strives for full bilingualism by the sixth grade. It differs in that the restoration approach often begins with

English as the language of instruction, and the native language is taught as a foreign language.

Bilingual education is more than simply language instruction, because language conveys the culture as well. Often bilingual instruction is joined with bicultural instruction, which teaches students about their ethnic culture at the same time it provides them with a background in general American culture. Bilingual instruction uses two languages for instruction for part or all of the classroom activities. In the U.S. one of the languages is English; the other language is that which is predominantly spoken in the home. For further information on bilingual education, consult fastback 84, *Learning in Two Languages.*

Seeing Similarities and Differences

All cultural education programs described in this fastback have similar broad-based goals (see figure 1). All assume a perspective of cultural relativism. Rather than viewing the values of a certain culture or ethnic group from the perspective of one's own culture, these programs are intended to develop the ability to perceive how other cultural/ethnic groups view their particular social realities. Not an easy task since most of us have been taught to think that our own cultural group ways are better than others (ethnocentrism). It is difficult to accept that our own cultural ways may be good only for our group.

Cultural relativism calls for viewing all cultures as co-existent and of equal value. It calls for abandoning such terminology as "underdeveloped" and "primitive" when referring to other nations. It discards labels that describe non-white, non-middle-class students as "culturally deprived," "disadvantaged," or "culturally deficient." It regards bilingualism as an asset rather than a liability, and black English becomes another dialect of American English rather than substandard English.

While cultural relativism requires that particular cultures be viewed from their own perspective, not all human activities can be condoned just because a particular culture practices them. Regrettably, some educators have taken cultural relativism to mean "anything goes as long as it is the way a culture functions." In the final analysis, teachers must help students to clarify ethical decisions about what is right or wrong about certain cultural behaviors. Making these decisions takes courage of convictions.

Cultural education programs accept cultural pluralism as a reality

Multicultural Education: Prepares students to live in multiethnic society
Intergroup Education: Prepares students to live in harmony with racially and culturally different people
U.S. Cultural Education
Bilingual Education: Prepares students to live in bilingual-bicultural environment
Global Education: Prepares students to perceive differences and similarities on a worldwide scale

Figure 1. Broad-based goals of cultural education programs

of our contemporary society. Cultural pluralism means cultural subgroups based on religious, racial, ethnic, linguistic, or economic affiliations co-exist harmoniously within the same society.

As cultural programs are taking hold in the public schools, we see a shift from the social theory of cultural assimilation to one of cultural pluralism. In the past public schools helped to assimilate European immigrants into the so-called American melting pot. But many scholars of American social history question the accuracy of describing U.S. culture as a melting pot—one in which cultural and ethnic differences have been homogenized. Rather, they use such analogies as "orchestra" or "salad bowl" or "stew" to describe the pluralistic nature of current U.S. culture. Within an orchestra, or a salad, or a stew, each entity retains its identity while blending with the whole. In a culturally pluralistic society each group retains its group identity while blending with other groups in the society.

Cultural education programs differ in their approach toward cultural pluralism. Some global educators view one aspect of cultural pluralism, ethnic identity, as an impediment toward global citizenship. Bruce Joyce and Alexander Nicholson assert:

> Although loyalty to an ethnic group provides a sense of identity and of morality, it also cuts groups of people off from others and thereby impoverishes everyone socially and culturally. When combined with poverty, ethnicity may be especially divisive.[5]

Ethnic group isolation is inimical to intercultural contact and association, but ethnic group isolation should not be confused with ethnic group self-esteem. Writes Leonard Kenworthy, "Differences do exist on our tiny planet. It is foolhardy to overlook them . . . But some of them enrich the world. What a dull, drab place it would be if we were all alike."[6]

Multicultural educators tend to view cultural pluralism as their *raison d'etre*. Their stance is that because we live in a multicultural society, school programs and curriculum should reflect this societal diversity. Edith King asserts, "What then is multiethnic education? It is the recognition and hence the inclusion of the heritage, history, traditions and customs, language and linguistic style, other contributions,

and the ongoing life-style of the many cultures and ethnic groups that constitute American society."[7]

Intergroup education emphasizes studying and understanding the ethnicity of others. Bilingual education emphasizes using the student's native language and culture as a means to bridge the gap between the dominant culture and the student's minority culture. The very nature of cultural pluralism negates easy generalizations about how cultural educators view the phenomenon, but most tend to recognize cultural pluralism as a societal reality.

Cultural educators hold in common the desire to reduce excessive ethnocentrism, the attitude of pride in one's own ethnic or ingroup culture. Ethnocentrism does provide for group solidarity and unity as a defense against outgroups. Nationalism is thus a type of ethnocentrism. Within a society, ethnocentrism serves the function of unifying a particular group's solidarity by building tribal or group allegiances. Ethnic groups in the U.S. have been allowed to develop tribal or group allegiances so long as the groups also espouse beliefs in a core national ethos such as "freedom and justice for all."

An extreme form of ethnocentrism, cultural chauvinism, presumes that one's ingroup culture and people are superior to others, and typically, the outgroup peoples are perceived as "barbaric" or "uncivilized." Any ethnic or cultural group is capable of chauvinistic beliefs and behaviors, but it does not follow that all ethnic or cultural groups are necessarily chauvinistic. When Brown Chicano Power advocates assert that "brown is beautiful" they do not necessarily imply that white is ugly nor that brown skin is superior to white.

Ethnic groups can have group pride without being chauvinistic. However, ethnic biases and prejudices usually spring from chauvinism rather than ethnic pride. Ethnic pride, while a mild form of ethnocentrism, is necessary for positive group identity and is thereby essential to cultural and ethnic group vitality. Cultural chauvinism, on the other hand, is a corrosive form of ethnocentrism; it is not necessary for positive group identity.

Cultural education programs are designed to reduce chauvinistic manifestations of ethnocentrism. Global education strives to teach students a global identity, one that recognizes the interdependence of all

peoples and yet recognizes the reality of identification with one's nation and cultural group. Global education strives toward building multiple loyalties rather than singular loyalty to an ethnic group or nation.

Multicultural and intergroup education both strive to reduce chauvinistic ethnocentrism. This is accomplished by studying and understanding the cultural differences of other groups as differences rather than deficits. By understanding another group from a cultural relativistic viewpoint, students can more easily accept and perhaps respect the group. Both also strive to reduce chauvinism by providing knowledge that counters distorted images and stereotypes commonly held in society.

Equal Educational Opportunity and Cultural Education

Equal educational opportunity is the stated ideology of our public education system. Given an equal chance to learn, the rhetoric runs, students from any race, social class, or ethnic group can succeed in school. In part, the ideology is correct. Some students need only "to pull themselves up by the bootstraps" and they succeed. But what happens to those students who have no boots, those students who experience discrimination because of their racial, ethnic, or social class differences? Many of these students do not experience an equal opportunity to learn.

All U.S. students do have access to a school; but not all students benefit equally from schooling. There is a distinct difference. Part of the problem lies with educators who perceive lower-class white and minority students as being less able to perform academically. The resulting self-fulfilling prophecy can be described as follows: Lower class white and minority students are less able. To be kind to them, we should lower our standards. Therefore, they can experience a modicum of school success. We lower our standards. They live up to the standards, and thereby are second rate.

Noted educator, Clark Kerr, reported in a 1979 Carnegie Foundation study, *Giving Youth A Better Chance: Options for Education, Work and Service*,[8] that one out of every three youths is ill-employed, ill-equipped, and ill-educated to succeed in U.S. society. Further, the report predicated that without vast educational improvements, the country faces the danger of producing a permanent lower class, and even worse, a self-perpetuating poverty culture. Schools, acting as screening agencies, play their societal roles by categorizing, training, and certifying students for occupations. As screening agents, schools are the unwitting perpetuators of a socioeconomic caste system that

relegates poor whites and minorities to society's lowest esteemed occupations and perpetuates the cycle of poverty.

Equal educational opportunity as a national education policy serves to check the school's unwitting gatekeeping function. To translate the ideal into the real, the federal government has promulgated an unequivocal policy of equal educational opportunity. The policy is couched in U.S. Supreme Court decisions and federal legislation, including:

1. *Brown v. Board of Education:* prohibits *de jure* racial segregation of schools;
2. *Civil Rights Act:* prohibits discrimination due to race in employment and education;
3. *Title IX, Education Amendment Acts:* prohibits discrimination in schools on the basis of sex;
4. *Lau v. Nichols:* prohibits discrimination due to language (non-English) difference;
5. *Education for All Handicapped Children Act:* prohibits discrimination in schools due to mental or physical handicap;
6. *Indian Education Act:* provides native Americans self-determination rights with education programs;
7. *Southeast Asian Refugee Children's Act:* provides money to assist with special programs for Southeast Asian students;
8. *Bilingual Education Act:* provides assistance for special bilingual programs for limited-English-speaking students.

Cultural education programs have been used as prescriptions for the ills of educational inequality. Bilingual education serves as a remedy for compliance with the *Lau v. Nichols* decision. The Bilingual Education Act (many states have similar state-level legislation) and the Southeast Asian Refugee Children's Act provide financial support for bilingual education. Multicultural and intergroup education provide remedies in desegregating schools. The Civil Rights Act provides financial and technical assistance for school systems that are attempting to be in compliance with *Brown v. Board of Education* and other desegregation mandates. Global education has no national mandate in the form of laws or Supreme Court decisions. Still, the better interests of our society are served with a citizenry that thinks globally.

Opening a New Frontier

The U.S. has long enjoyed an unlimited frontier with bountiful forests, fertile soil, and abundant minerals. That frontier is now closing, and this is dramatically illustrated in our insatiable thirst for petroleum fuels, which has precipitated a national crisis and a worldwide search for alternative sources of energy. Now is the time for opening a new frontier with people as our natural resources. In this era of depleting natural resources, perplexing economic problems, and pessimism about our future, the conservation of all resources—especially the education of all youth—is the challenge of the day.

The role cultural education can play in this new frontier is awesome. Hopefully, cultural education will capitalize on the language and cultural resources that the Boat People and other Southeast Asian refugees bring to our shores. Rather than transforming Southeast Asians into monolingual Americans, we clearly need to foster their bilingualism, a future resource of immense value to our national interests. The same hope goes for the new Cuban refugees who landed on our shores. The opportunity to transform a purported liability into an asset now exists. Bilingual education should not be allowed to wither. Instead, it should be expanded to include all students.

What cultural education programs should schools adopt? My bias is that school should *only do as much as can be done well, but that at least one of the programs should be fully implemented.* Developmentally, I stress a two-step approach that first builds students' awareness of self and then builds awareness of others.

The first step, self-awareness, includes a study of the students' ethnic heritage, their current ethnic or cultural group status, and the

linkage between their national group and their countries of origin. This dimension provides students a sense of "roots" and a sense of linkage with other countries, which lead to a pluralistic awareness and a global identity.

The second step, awareness of others, includes a study of the heritages of U.S. ethnic groups, the current status of the groups, and then a study of the linkage the groups have with other nations. Again, a pluralistic, global identity of others is fostered.

My other bias is that the development of students' self-esteem through experiencing a genuine understanding of their cultural and ethnic heritage is an educational fundamental. Once students achieve a healthy sense of self, they should be encouraged to develop loyalty toward their nationality, a loyalty based on an intellectually honest account of U.S. history. An intellectually honest loyalty to one's nation need not deter one from developing a global perspective, and perhaps, a global identity. Ethnic identity, national identity, and global identity are not mutually exclusive notions.

Cultural educators need to solidify their efforts. Their goals are more alike than different. Their differences are more a matter of focus than of substance. Each has emerged as a response to an educative need and as a desire to improve the human condition. While each may promote its self-interest, none can be championed as the most important. They are all necessary.

Footnote References

1. David S. Hoopes, *Fastback 142, Intercultural Education* (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1980), p. 19.
2. William P. Shaw, *Global Education: Helping Secondary Students Understand International Issues*, A Kettering Foundation-Dattweiler Institute Report (Dayton, Ohio: I/D/E/A, 1974), p. 10.
3. James Banks, *Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises* (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1977), pp. 8-9.
4. Hilda Taba, Elizabeth Brady, and John Robinson, *Intergroup Education in Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952).
5. Bruce Joyce and Alexander Nicholson, "Imperatives for Global Education," in James M. Becker, *Schooling for a Global Age* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), pp. 104-105.
6. Leonard S. Kensworthy, *The International Dimension of Education* (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970), p. 11.
7. Edith King, *Teaching Ethnic Awareness* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1980), p. 5.
8. Clark Kerr, *Giving Youth A Better Chance: Options for Education, Work, Service* (Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, November 1979).

List of Resources

Textbooks

Banks, James A. *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Becker, James M., ed. *Schooling for a Global Age.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Cortes, Carlos E., et al. *Understanding You and Them.* Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Education Consortium, 1976.

Garcia, Ricardo L. *Teaching in a Pluralistic Society: Concepts, Models, Strategies.* New York: Harper and Row (in press).

King, David C. *International Education for Spaceship Earth.* New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1971.

King, Edith W. *The World: Context for Teaching in the Elementary School.* Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1971.

Resource Units, Guidelines, Handbooks

American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education
Suite 610
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Multicultural Teacher Education: Preparing Educators to Provide Educational Equity.

Multicultural Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Resources.

Pluralism and the American Teacher: Issues and Case Studies.

Multicultural Education and Ethnic Studies in the United States: An Analysis and Annotated Bibliography of Selected Documents in ERIC.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
225 North Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

The International Dimension of Education.

In Praise of Diversity: A Resource Book for Multicultural Education.

Multicultural Education: A Functional Bibliography for Teachers.

In Praise of Diversity: Multicultural Classroom Applications.

Multicultural Education: Commitments, Issues and Applications.

National Association for the Education of Young Children
1834 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Cultural Awareness: A Resource Bibliography

National Association of Independent Schools
4 Liberty Square
Boston, MA 02109

Handbook: *Internationalize Your School*

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1500 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 802
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Reading in the Bilingual Classroom: Literacy and Biliteracy.

Toward Quality in Bilingual Education.

National Council for the Social Studies
3615 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education.

Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies.

International Learning and International Education in a Global Age.

Phi Delta Kappa
Eighth and Union, Box 789
Bloomington, IN 47402

Fastbacks

#28, Becker, James. *Education for a Global Society.*

#84, Garcia, Ricardo. *Learning in Two Languages.*

#87, Banks, James. *Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises.*

#107, Garcia, Ricardo. *Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multiethnic Education.*

#142, Hoopes, David. *Intercultural Education.*